

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

for meeting of

April 6, 2012

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

April 6, 2012

Technical Committee Minutes

1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the March 2 TPB Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

2. **Briefing on Regional Bike to Work Day 2012**

Mr. Franklin briefed the Committee on the regional Bike to Work Day event being organized for Friday May 18th. He stated that Bike to Work Day celebrates bicycling to work as a viable means of commuting and free and open to all commuters in the National Capital Region. The event has representation from all COG jurisdictions and brings out dozens of elected officials from local city and county governments, as well as members of Congress. The event welcomes both novice and seasoned bike commuters and coincides with National Bike to Work Week. Mr. Franklin explained that Bike to Work Day helps empower commuters to try bicycling to work for the first time and pointed to a recent COG survey of Bike to Work Day participants. In the survey, 17% of respondents never commuted by bike before participating, and 10% of participants subsequently started biking to work after the event. The survey also found that the Bike to Work Day event provided the impetus for 22% of participants who previously biked to work to start bicycling to work more often after the event.

Bike to Work Day is organized by Commuter Connections and the Washington Area Bicyclist Association and the Steering Committee begins planning each year eight months in advance. The event has grown tremendously as just five years ago there were 26 "pit stops" throughout region and 6,600 bicyclists, and last year there were a total of 49 pit stops and 11,000 bicyclists. For 2012, there are scheduled to be 58 pit stops with a goal of 12,500 registrants.

Registration is open at www.biketoworkmetrodc.org and COG sent out a registrants who attend a pit stop will receive a free T-shirt and a chance to win raffle prizes; to date, 2,100 have registered.

New marketing materials were created for Bike to Work Day 2012 and the theme is "Bike in Good Company". Approximately 90,000 flyers/rack cards were printed, with a small quantity printed in Spanish for the first time. Flyers were also distributed to employers throughout the region along with a letter encouraging participation among employees and tips on how to be a bike friendly business. A radio spot will also be produced to begin airing in late April.

The 2012 Bike to Work Day event registration web site was launched. Previous to this year, the Bike to Work Day web pages were part in parcel within the WABA web site. The 2012 web site is a stand-alone site, dedicated solely to the event and is located at www.biketoworkmetrodc.org. With a dedicated site, more freedom was available to allow additional content and more focus on two key audiences; employers and new participants.

COG conducted a successful sponsorship drive which started in October 2011 and raised \$45,000, most of which will go toward the purchase of T-shirts for the event. Gold and Silver level sponsors will appear on the T-Shirt. In addition to cash, in-kind raffle prizes were donated including a folding bike and a hybrid/electric bike. Also 8' vinyl banners will be created for each of the pit stops which contain the look and feel of the poster and featured a custom area for pit stop location specifics.

At the April TPB meeting, Chairman Turner will sign a Proclamation (included in the meeting packet) recognizing May 18th as Bike to Work Day throughout the National Capital Region. The Proclamation was enlarged and mounted on foam core and the Proclamation will be placed onto the web site, along with a photo of the signing.

Mr. Erenrich asked if helmets are a requirement for participation and why Montgomery County was not listed on the event flyer, whereas Arlington and Alexandria do appear. Mr. Franklin explained that although helmets are not required, the web site notes that they are strongly recommended. The logos that appear on the marketing materials are from paid sponsors and the web site lists all of the pit stop locations within the various jurisdictions.

Mr. Rawlings inquired whether member jurisdictions will be asked to hold their own Bike to Work Day proclamations. Mr. Franklin stated that part of the proclamation itself is to indeed encourage COG member jurisdictions to adopt similar proclamations for Bike to Work Day.

Mr. Kirby was interested in knowing who pays for the raffle prizes. Mr. Franklin noted that all items are being donated by two bicycle shops, City Bikes and BicycleSPACE. In exchange they receive exposure on the event marketing materials, including the T-Shirt.

Mr. Rawlings asked how the hybrid-electric bicycle works. Mr. Franklin stated that it rides like a conventional bicycle with manual pedaling except it also allows bicyclists to use the battery to ride farther and faster with more power when needed for hills etc.

A Committee member asked whether there was marketing on the Metro? Mr. Franklin acknowledged that although there is no marketing on the Metro system for Bike to Work Day, WMATA does provide PSA ad space for the COG organized Car Free Day event.

Mr. Milone asked who the top employers are who typically have the greatest number of employees participating in Bike to Work Day. Mr. Franklin noted that the National Institutes of Health is the largest, followed by others employers within the region such as Orbital Sciences, the University of Maryland, U.S. State Department, and Booz Allen Hamilton.

Mr. Kirby inquired whether these employers do something special to promote bike use within their organizations. Mr. Franklin stated that the commonalities are an active bike club, secure bike racks, shower facilities, lockers, and that some even have bicycling shirts with the company's logo.

3. Briefing on Comments Received and Proposed Responses for Revising the Regional Complete Streets Guidance and Policy Template

Mr. Farrell reviewed the comments received from the Citizens Advisory Committee and the TPB on the draft Complete Streets Guidance and Policy Template. The Citizens Advisory Committee had suggested that there should be a Complete Streets policy, and that implementation of Complete Streets principles should be better documented, with firm deadlines. In response to the comments from the TPB, Mr. Farrell had prepared a draft Complete Streets policy statement, a Complete Streets Guidance and Policy Template, and a draft project description form for the TIP, which he distributed to the Committee.

Mr. Erenrich passed out a newly adopted Complete Streets policy for Montgomery County. The Montgomery County policy refers to "roadways", which keeps the focus more narrow than in the draft regional document.

Mr. Farrell noted that VDOT had objected to the use of the term "roadway" in the regional guidance, because, according to MUTCD, that applies only to the area from curb face to curb face. That definition is too narrow; we want to include the entire right of way. Mr. Erenrich replied that it would be easy to define the term for purposes of the regional guidance. The current policy guidance would require too many exemptions.

Mr. Farrell replied that an exemption does not represent a failure to comply; and there are lots of legitimate reasons for taking exemptions.

Ms. Hoeffner wanted to know what type of projects would require bicycle and pedestrian facilities. VRE has many projects in the TIP for which it would need exemptions.

Mr. Srikanth said that the definition of roadway had gone through legal reviews, and is taken as binding. It's hard to come up with an alternative term that is broader but not too broad. Mr. Srikanth expressed some doubt about the purpose of MPO action, since the States and local jurisdictions already have their own policies, even if they do not call them "Complete Streets".

Mr. Kirby reminded the group that the TPB would be briefed on the draft documents as an information item on April 18th. There is no hard deadline for taking action.

Mr. Srikanth suggested that, since due to time constraints the TPB had not been able to have a full briefing and discussion in March, and since certain TPB members were not present when the item came up, that we should go back to them on April 18th with the same document as they saw in March.

Mr. Kirby thought that we had sufficient feedback from the TPB and the CAC to proceed with a fresh draft, and that the changes were an improvement. It would not be a good

outcome if we were to present the same document to the TPB again, and get the same comments.

Mr. Kirby suggested revision the definition of “Complete Streets” to say what it does, but not include the term “transportation facility” or “roadway”.

Ms. Matthews suggested that a matrix of local policies be provided. Mr. Farrell replied that such a matrix had been prepared for the January Complete Streets stakeholders workshop. Most of the jurisdictions either already have a Complete Streets policy or are moving towards one. Mr. Kirby suggested adding a section in the memo explaining where the jurisdictions are. Mr. Kirby noted that at a recent meeting of the Fairfax County Citizens Advisory Committee the question of a Complete Streets policy came up. While Fairfax County has elements of a Complete Streets policy in various documents, it is not summarized in one place, and Mr. Kirby thought there might be some value in doing so.

Mr. Rawlings thought that this draft was much improved, and said that DDOT would likely support it.

Mr. Austin asked about the timing of documenting Complete Streets in the TIP. Mr. Kirby said that it would not be included in the July call for projects, but in a subsequent call.

Mr. Burns asked if the reporting requirement could have political implications. Mr. Kirby replied that there is no requirement that a project comply with the regional policy template.

Ms. Backmon expressed concern that many projects in Prince William County would not meet one of the approved exemptions, and provision of pedestrian or bicycle facilities would conflict with existing plans and policies. Mr. Erenrich suggested that this policy might make it more difficult to build roads without pedestrian or bicycle facilities, and adding such facilities could be expensive. Mr. Kirby noted that there are exemptions for high cost and/or low use.

Mr. Kirby suggested adding another exemption to the TIP form, covering consistency with local plans and policies.

4. Briefing on Household Travel Characteristics and Behavior in Six Focused Geographic Subareas of the Region

Mr. Griffiths gave a PowerPoint presentation that highlighted the initial results from the Fall 2011 TPB Geographically-Focused Household Travel Surveys conducted in seven geographic areas in the TPB Planning region. These areas were Logan Circle/14th Street, in the District of Columbia, the Purple Line/International Corridor in Montgomery and Prince George’s County, White Flint in Montgomery County, Largo in Prince George’s County, Reston in Fairfax County, Woodbridge in Prince William County, and the City of Frederick, Maryland. The presentation gave the daily and commuting modal shares for each of these areas based on the initial survey results.

Mr. Erenrich commented that including maps of each of the surveyed geographic areas in the presentation would be helpful.

Mr. Kirby suggested that the modal shares for the entire TPB planning region be included in the presentation for comparison with the modal shares in each of the seven geographic areas.

Mr. Srikanth suggest that rather than just showing the regional average modal shares, the presentation should also show the modal shares for different concentric rings emanating out from the center of the regional. He noted that modal shares for the outer jurisdictions, some distance from the center of the region, were likely to be much different from the regional core area and the appropriate comparison should be within each concentric ring.

Mr. Griffiths thanked the members of the Committee for their suggestions and said that he would be making a number of refinements in the presentation on the Geographically-Focused Household Travel Surveys that he would be giving to the TPB at their April 18th meeting.

5. Briefing on the Results of Recently Completed Projects under the Continuous Airport Systems Planning (CASP) Program

Mr. Roisman ran through his presentation, which was changed slightly from the March presentation since this item is planned to go on the April TPB agenda as an information item.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the travel times shown were a composite of highway and transit. Mr. Roisman responded that they were highway travel times only and that the slides would be updated to reflect that information.

Mr. Erenrich asked why PM peak period travel times to Dulles from Frederick would be faster than going from Rockville to Dulles. Mr. Roisman responded that the routing from Frederick to Dulles used US 340, US 15, and the Dulles Greenway, whereas the travel from Rockville used I-270, I-495, and the Dulles Access Road.

A Committee member asked if the mode of access data could be further disaggregated. Mr. Roisman responded that the modes had been collapsed for the presentation but the full breakdown was available in the 2009 Air Passenger Survey findings report.

Mr. Rodgers asked if the mode of access data could be broken out by regional activity centers that have transit access. Mr. Roisman responded that such analysis could be included in the analysis of the 2011 Air Passenger Survey, which is ongoing and expected to be complete by late summer.

It was suggested by Mr. Griffiths to put back the slide discussing the role of air systems in the TPB Vision that had appeared in the March presentation to the Committee but was omitted from this version. Mr. Roisman agreed to put the slide back into the presentation.

6. Update on Reauthorization of Federal Surface Transportation Legislation

Mr. Kirby said that Congress recently passed a three-month extension of the federal surface transportation authorization. He said there is a two-year bill in the Senate, while the House wants a five-year bill. He noted the difficulty of passing a longer-term bill before the election. He said that performance measurement has been emphasized in legislative measures supported by USDOT.

Mr. Erenrich observed that USDOT had again received a very large number of applications for the recent round of the TIGER program.

Mr. Kirby said that he felt the TPB's TIGER application was very competitive. He said he hoped to get a response regarding the application in less than a month.

Mr. Erenrich described the gas tax proposals under consideration by the Maryland General Assembly.

Mr. Kirby noted that in Virginia funding for the Dulles Rail project was uncertain at the state level.

Mr. Srikanth said that the Virginia General Assembly was still in negotiations regarding funding for Dulles Rail.

7. Briefing on 2010 Census Urbanized Areas in and Near the Washington Region

Mr. Roisman gave his presentation. Mr. Erenrich asked how residents of Baltimore City who commute to the TPB modeled area for work are accounted for; Mr. Roisman responded that those trips are picked up in the external trip forecasts included in the TPB travel demand forecasting model.

Mr. Malouff asked how the boundary between the Washington and Baltimore urbanized areas was determined. Mr. Roisman responded that the decision is made by the Census Bureau but once a boundary is established the process tries to maintain that historical boundary; for example, a portion of the Baltimore urbanized area is in northern Prince George's County, a TPB member jurisdiction.

Mr. Erenrich asked about the measured area of the TPB modeled region; Mr. Roisman responded that the land area of the TPB modeled region is around 6,800 square miles. Mr. Erenrich noted that the WMATA subsidy formula is tied to urbanized area population and so this information will be used in that computation. Mr. Roisman noted that he had received inquiries from other WMATA staff about the information presented today.

8. Update on the Development of the TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP)

Mr. Kirby spoke to a PowerPoint. He reviewed the schedule for developing the RTPP. The presentation focused on the recent public outreach and lessons learned. In January and February listening sessions were held with regional stakeholder groups and citizens, including the Citizens Advisory Committee, the Air Quality Public Advisory Committee, the Access for All Committee, and others.

Mr. Kirby said that three key lessons were learned from this experience: 1) To use both narrative and performance measures to present regional goals and challenges; 2) To use the narrative to identify which performance measures best inform the process; and 3) While some performance measures are best presented at the regional level, for other measures regional disaggregation is more meaningful.

He said that in preparation for an upcoming focus group with the general public, TPB staff will prepare a new document and a companion presentation. The purpose of the focus group is to determine if the proposed challenges and strategies are meaningful. The focus group will be held on a Saturday with about 50-60 people. The morning session would include a discussion of goals and challenges and the afternoon session would include a discussion of strategies. Participants would have an opportunity to rank challenges and strategies. A draft RTPP interim report 2 incorporating the feedback from the listening sessions and focus group will be presented to the Technical Committee, the CAC, and the Board in June.

9. Other Business

None.

10. Adjourn